



Minutes of Annual Parish Council Meeting

Held on Tuesday 29th May 2018

Chairman: Councillor Mrs V Lynch
Councillors: Councillor Mr M Bird, Councillor Mr D Clements, Councillor Dr L Kennedy, Councillor Dr H Price and Councillor Mr N Rickard
Apologies: Councillor Mr A Coulson, Councillor Mrs M Lawrence and District Councillor Mr P Cooper
Clerk Mrs R Biley
Attendance: County Councillor Mrs N Glover
Parishioners 9

1. Agree Chairman & Sign Declaration of Office

The Clerk opened the meeting and asked councillors for nomination of Chairman for the next twelve months. Councillor Rickard nominated Councillor Lynch, this was seconded by Councillor Kennedy and Councillor Bird. The Clerk asked Councillor Lynch to accept the post of chairman and the declaration of office was signed.

2. Apologies for absences

Apologies were received from Councillor Coulson and Councillor Lawrence, these were accepted by the Council.

3. Disclosure of interest on items in agenda

Councillors had no items to disclose on the agenda.

4. Comments from District Councillor, County Councillor and Police

County Councillor Glover gave her report to the Council which included advising of additional funding to deal with the issue of potholes in the county, tackling homelessness and the annual debate which focussed on technology this year. Full report available as an appendix.

Apologies were received from District Councillor Cooper and no Police were present.

5. Sign off of minutes Parish Council Meeting 2018 05 01 Parish Council Meeting 2018 05 15

The minutes were approved and signed as an accurate recording of the meetings held on 1st May 2018 and 15th May 2018.

6. Confirm:

6.1. Councillor Areas of Responsibility

1199

Signed by
Chairman

- 6.2. Standing Orders (new)**
- 6.3. Asset Register**
- 6.4. Financial Regulations**
- 6.5. All publication Documents**
 - Inc. Financial Controls document**

The Clerk set out the documents which the council would be approving and asked councillors to confirm that the documents were correct and would supersede all other versions. Councillor Price advised that there were some formatting issues within the financial regulations document, the Chairman advised she would correct these. The Clerk asked the Council to confirm they were happy with the content of the document subject to the formatting. The council voted for all documents to be approved.

7. Accounts 2017/2018

7.1. Annual Governance Approval and Sign

The council confirmed that it had taken all steps necessary to protect the Parish accounts and the Annual Governance was approved and then signed by the Chairman and Clerk/ RFO.

7.2. Annual Accounting Statement Approval and Sign

The council approved the accounting statement as an accurate statement of the accounts. This was then signed by the Chairman and Clerk / RFO.

7.3. Explanation of Variances Approval and Sign

The Clerk went through the explanation of significant variances on the accounts, including the large variance of the asset register.

7.4. Accountants statement of Accounts Approval and Sign

The clerk asked councillors to confirm that the accountant's statement was an accurate statement of the accounts. This was confirmed by unanimous vote and the document was signed off by the chairman.

- ## **8. Accounts 2018/2019**
- 8.1. Approval of Rospa Play safety Cost - £163.80**
 - 8.2. Approval of repair to pavilion hot water - £350+vat**

The above payments were approved by unanimous vote.

- ## **9. Planning**
- 9.1. 18/01388/APP - 42 Nup End Lane Wingrave Buckinghamshire HP22 4PX**
 - Installation of two dormer windows to the rear elevation as part of a loft conversion**

The application was introduced by Councillor Lynch and it was proposed to vote no objection to this application. This was confirmed by unanimous vote.

- 9.2. 17/04105/ADP (Baldways) - Land At Leighton Road Wingrave Buckinghamshire**

1200

Signed by
Chairman

Approval of reserved matters pursuant to outline permission 15/03814/AOP relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for a residential development of up to 40 residential dwellings.

Councillor Kennedy gave a report on the application which confirmed that whilst not all concerns had been met, the working group was happy that for the most part compromises had been made in relation to the requests, with exception of the request of restrictions to noise and vehicle access. For this reason the Council voted in favour of no objections. The Clerk advised that whilst the matter of noise and access were not planning matters she would include them in the comments to AVDC.

9.3. 18/01436/ALB - Floyds Farm House Mill Lane Wingrave Buckinghamshire HP22 4PL

Erection of an oak framed garden room to rear elevation.

9.4. 18/01435/APP- Floyds Farm House Mill Lane Wingrave Buckinghamshire HP22 4PL

Erection of an oak framed garden room to rear elevation.

Councillor Lynch discussed the applications and explanations were given for the two applications (one for planning and one for heritage) and saw no reason for any objections, this was supported by unanimous vote by the Council.

**9.5. 18/01534/APP - Mapandus Lower End Wingrave Buckinghamshire HP22 4PG
Single storey side extension and new dormer window to rear elevation**

Councillor Kennedy introduced the application and saw no reason for any objections, The Clerk advised that there had been a revised drawing submitted but these were the same as those that had been viewed.

Councillor Lynch asked the Council to vote in favour of no objections, this was supported by unanimous vote.

**9.6. 18/01718/ALB - 10 Recreation Ground, Wingrave, HP22 4PH
Replacement of Conservatory Roof**

The council discussed the application and voted in favour of no objections to this application.

10. Request for consideration of protecting Twelve Leys Green & Wingrave Park from Vehicle Access

The Clerk advised she had received a request to consider whether Twelve Leys Green and Wingrave Park were sufficiently protected from unwanted vehicular access. The Council discussed the situation with help from WWRSASC Chairman, Mr Bracey-Wright and agreed it would be prudent to complete a risk assessment on the areas.

Councillor Clements agreed to action this and report at the next meeting of the Council.

11. Consideration of new authorised account signatory

The clerk advised that due to extended leave of Councillor Coulson it was necessary to appoint a new signatory to the accounts and proposed Councillor Price. This was approved by unanimous vote.

Meeting ended 20.30

1202

Signed by
Chairman

Item 3 County Councillor Report- Mrs N Glover

Item 9.2 Baldways Report- Dr L Kennedy

Baldways Development and Ridgepoint Ltd.

Ridgepoint Ltd are the Developers of the Baldways site in the Parish Neighbourhood Plan. The Plan prepared by Corylus that was agreed with the Parish Council (PC) is known as Plan Revision N. Unbeknown to the Parish Council AVDC approved a Plan known as Revision P. Ridgepoint Ltd acquired Revision P from Corylus on the presumption that this was agreed with the Parish Council. The PC and the PC’s site Working Group objected to the Ridgepoint Planning Application. A number of meetings have been held with Nick McEntyre of Ridgepoint to address the differences between Revision N and P. The nine PC objections/requests in its letter are detailed below and the table below shows outcomes. The objections & requests are detailed on the left in the table below with comments on the right. In the table the “Success” is shaded in green, the “Partial Successes” are shaded in blue and the “Failures” in red. As can be seen, whilst the PC sub-committee have been active, persistent and as “upbeat” as possible, our overall success rate in getting adaptations to address our concerns has been woefully poor. Even the depth of the buffer zone is a good deal less than the outline planning permission (Revision N) requires it to be.

We are disappointed that we had never had any support from the AVDC Planning team who never at any stage openly engaged with the Developer in support of our concerns. The meetings the developer had with the AVDC Planning team resulted in their (the AVDC) own wider agenda being pushed and we (the PC sub-committee) were left to fight on our own with the Developer as best we could. We think the AVDC Planning Team did well to get the rooflines less uniform but they failed to take the real benefit afforded by the buffer zones and come up with a better plan for their long term management and security.

<p>1. Visitor Parking within the Development: We are looking for six further additional [ie 12 in all] visitor and delivery parking spaces to be incorporated within the development</p>	<p>Partial success. They added 4 not 6 so we have a total of 10 not 12.</p>
<p>2. Long-term management and security of the Wildlife Corridor [to the West]: So, our suggestion would be to ensure that the Corridor is planted with native shrubs and bushes that would grow to a height not exceeding circa 6 feet and provide the necessary newt and natural wildlife corridor whilst at the same time preventing human access</p>	<p>Failure. The only commitment is to put a post and rail fence at each end which is neither a robust long term security solution nor does it obviate the need for regular mowing, hedge cutting etc.</p>
<p>3. Long-term management and security of the buffer zone [to the South] We would be looking to see the requirement to transfer these parts of the land edged blue [to adjoining neighbours] in the site plan included as a commitment on the part of the Applicant in the Landscape Management Plan required pursuant to Condition 10 of the Outline Planning Permission</p>	<p>Failure. Neighbours offered to be members of the Estate Management Company – not popular. Not a satisfactory security solution from neighbours’ point of view.</p>
<p>4. Proximity of Plot 1 [first new plot on the left] to 5 Baldways Close: We are looking for an adjustment to the layout to create greater separation between Plot 1 and 5 Baldways Close</p>	<p>Partial success. Removal of garage, and room above, ought to give John and Louise an additional 7 or 8 feet or so separation. When you are outside 7 or 8 feet really doesn’t seem like much. But it is something.</p>

<p>5.Height of the proposed house on Plot 35: We are looking for the Applicant to consider whether its proposal for the site could be adjusted to swap the house on Plot 35 for a fourth bungalow.</p>	<p>Failure. It's still going to be a tall house. An original offer to lower the gradient of the roof was subsequently swept aside by a general adjustment of all roof lines to meet the Planner's concerns. Paul Evans (a Leighton Rd resident) is still emailing Nick McEntyre on this and also requesting more trees in the buffer. At this time we have no knowledge as to whether Ridgepoint will respond to this request.</p>
<p>6.Noise and disruption whilst the development is carried out: a. All construction traffic parking to be contained within the site; b. All substantial construction traffic to enter and leave Wingrave from the direction of the Mentmore Crossroads (and not through the centre of the village) and to avoid peak commuter hours; c. All noisy work to be carried out only between the hours of 8.00am to 6.00pm Monday to Friday. No noisy work outside those times or at all on weekends or on bank holidays.</p>	<p>Failure – we've seen nothing from the Developer or Planners about these issues.</p>
<p>7.Health and Safety Risk posed by the balancing pond: We are looking for appropriate fencing of the balancing pond to be provided.</p>	<p>Success. Yes, this will be fenced along the lines of Raven's Walk.</p>
<p>8.Long-term maintenance of the internal road: We would be looking to you to ensure that the Applicant's proposals contain adequate provision for the long- term maintenance of the internal road.</p>	<p>Failure – no comment in any document uploaded that this will be properly looked after.</p>
<p>9.Foul Sewage treatment from the site: We would be looking to you to require evidence that the Applicant's proposals are comprehensively viable and acceptable to Thames Water (and, if relevant, to Anglian Water who also operate sewers within Wingrave).</p>	<p>Failure – no commitment from anyone on this.</p>

The Parish Council is agreeing **no objection** to the Planning Application but would still like consideration to be given to our outstanding issues, those in orange and in particular point 6.